

EXHIBIT G

Excerpts of the transcript for the final approval hearing in Barani v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 12-cv-02999-GPC-KSC (S.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2015).

In The Case Of

*Carrie Couser, Individually and on Behalf of All Others
Similarly Situated,*

v.

Comenity Bank

3:12-cv-02484-MMA-BGS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

REZA BARANI, INDIVIDUALLY AND	.
ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS	.
SIMILARLY SITUATED,	.
	. Docket
Plaintiffs,	. No. 12-cv-2999-GPC-KSC
	.
v.	. March 6, 2015
	. 1:37 p.m.
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,	.
	.
Defendant.	. San Diego, California
.

TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING/FAIRNESS HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE GONZALO P. CURIEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S

For the Plaintiffs:

Hyde & Swigart
2221 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101
San Diego, California 92108
By: JOSHUA B. SWIGART, ESQ.
- AND -
Kazerouni Law Group, APC
245 Fischer Avenue, Suite D1
Costa Mesa, California 92626
By: ABBAS KAZEROUNIAN, ESQ.

For the Defendant:

Severson & Werson
19100 Von Karman Avenue, 7th Floor
Irvine, California 92612
By: ERIC J. TROUTMAN, ESQ.

Court Reporter:

Chari L. Possell, RPR, CRR
USDC Clerk's Office
333 West Broadway, Suite 420
San Diego, California 92101
chari_possell@casd.uscourts.gov

Reported by Stenotype, Transcribed by Computer

1 always inherent risks in class actions as far as certifying the
2 class, avoiding decertification, having the Appellate Court
3 conclude that the certification was appropriate, and so it is
4 in this case. There are -- there would have been risks of
5 maintaining the class action through trial.

6 The Court also is relying upon the experience and the
7 views of counsel in this determination. All of the attorneys
8 for the plaintiffs are very seasoned, between the Kazerouni Law
9 Group and Hyde & Swigart, in handling not only class actions
10 but specifically class actions under the TCPA.

11 If this case were to proceed to trial, undoubtedly there
12 would be delays. There would be expense, both at the trial
13 stage, post trial, with respect to post-trial motions and then
14 again on appeal.

15 So for all those reasons, the Court concludes that this
16 settlement is fair to all the party members. It's reasonable
17 given the countervailing factors identified.

18 So I am prepared to approve the proposed settlement and
19 order payment from the settlement proceeds to the claimants'
20 claims administrator in compliance with the Court's preliminary
21 approval order and modified approval order, the agreement and
22 the amended agreement.

23 The Court will grant the motion for attorney's fees and
24 costs and incentive payment. The Court finds that the attorney
25 fees requested, a little bit less than 25 percent -- it's